



PRESENT:

Mr. F. Wayne Bass, Chairman
Dr. William P. Brown, Vice Chairman
Mr. Russell Gulley
Mr. Sam R. Hassen
Mr. Reuben J. Waller, Jr.
Mr. Kirkland A. Turner, Secretary to the Commission,
Planning Director

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Bill Dupler, Deputy County Administrator,
Community Development
Mr. Glenn E. Larson, Assistant Director, Plans and
Information Section, Planning Department
Ms. Tara McGee, Assistant County Attorney,
County Attorney's Office
Mr. David W. Robinson, Senior Assistant County Attorney,
County Attorney's Office
Ms. Barbara Fassett, Planning Manager, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Steven F. Haasch, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Zachary Mayo, Planning Data and Geographic Analyst,
Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department
Ms. Heather Barrar, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. James K. Bowling, Principal Planner, Advance Planning
Research Section, Planning Department
Ms. Pamela Nichols, Clerk to the Commission,
Administration Section, Planning Department
Ms. Emily Masters, Administrative Secretary,
Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Michael E. Tompkins, Assistant Director,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Beverly Rogers, Planning Administrator
Planning Department
Mr. George "Bubba" Bowles, Senior Engineer,
Utilities Department
Battalion Chief James Fitch, Fire Administration, Budget & Planning
Fire and EMS
Mr. Donald Kappel, Director,
Public Affairs

Mr. Rob Key, Director,
General Services
Mr. James Banks, Assistant Director,
Transportation Department
Mr. R. John McCracken, Director,
Transportation Department
Mr. Stuart Connock, Chief of Parks/Design and Construction,
Parks and Recreation Department
Mr. Rick Witt, Interim Director,
Building Inspection Department
Mr. Dick McElfish, Director, Environmental
Engineering Department
Dr. Cynthia O. Richardson, Director of Planning,
School Administration
Mr. Dave Wolverton, Microcomputer Analyst
Information Systems Technology

SPECIAL MEETING.

Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen, Waller and staff assembled at 1:00 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, 10001 Iron Bridge Road Chesterfield, VA, for a special meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Bass called the special meeting to order in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building.

II. INVOCATION.

Mr. Bass presented the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Commissioners led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

IV. REQUEST OF POSTPONE ACTION, EMERGENCY ADDITIONS, CHANGES IN THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION.

There were no requests to postpone action, emergency additions, or changes in the order of presentation.

V. APPROVAL OF APRIL 28, 2011 MINUTES.

Mr. Hassen advised staff of the corrections for the April 28, 2011 draft minutes. Sentence on page 5 should read "Mr. Hassen stated that he agreed with Dr. Brown; **however, and that the biggest decision is whether the Commission is going to accept to leave the Countryside designation and the proposed densities that are suggested**".

On motion of Mr. Hassen, seconded by Mr. Waller, the Commission resolved to defer consideration of the April 28, 2011 Draft Comprehensive Plan Minutes.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

VI. PUBLIC FACILITIES ELEMENT.

Staff presented the Public Facilities Element at the May 23, 2011 special meeting.

The Commission began review of the Public Facilities Element. A summary of the Commission's recommendations, to be voted on at a future work session, is set forth below:

Page 1 - Add wording to read "Use environmentally friendly building principles and practices in the design, rehabilitation and construction of public facilities as well as reduction of site disturbance and building footprints in public facility design **where appropriate.**"

P 27. Green Building: Add wording to read "Promote the use of third party green building certification systems in the design of public facilities **where appropriate.**"

P 34. Planning Coordination: Add wording to read "Base annual **staff** revisions to the Capital Improvement Program on the recommendations of the Public Facilities Plan."

P 42. Alignment: Change wording to read "~~Align~~ **Coordinate** other department master plans and similar documents with the Vision, goals, objective and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan."

Mr. Gulley commented that mandates were removed from the general context of the draft Plan; therefore, it should be removed from the Action Items.

Mr. Hassen noted that the Commission agreed to remove the words "policy/policies" for the draft Plan; therefore, the Action Items should reflect those changes.

VII. PUBLIC FACILITIES PLAN (PFP) DISCUSSION.

Mr. Steve Haasch provided an outline of the presentation which included topics on Purpose of the Public Facilities Plan; Process and Involvement; Existing Facility Data and Statistic; Issues; Philosophy; Level of Service Standards; Data Modeling; Facility Recommendations; and Actions Related to the Public Facilities Plan. He stated the Public Facilities Plan was a guiding document that outlines general site and location characteristics for major public facilities; and identifies facility needs based on objective data and analysis. He stated the Public Facilities Plan is not an operation, funding, staffing or design document. He then explained the Public Facilities Plan uses, process, modeling and approved housing development pipeline. Mr. Haasch also provided data on the recommended Level of Service standards, current and twenty (20) year Level of Service projection for schools; recommended Level of Service standards for Fire and EMS, libraries and parks. He then provided an overview of the draft Public Facilities Plan general recommendations for Fire and EMS, Police, Sheriff's Office (jail), libraries, schools, parks, general services and telecommunications.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Ms. Lorna Parkins stated the benchmarking data for Level of Service was included in the Issue Briefs and that staff would provide copies for the Commission.

Mr. Waller suggested for staff to include the definitions for functional and physical capacity to the presentation slides.

Dr. Cynthia Richardson stated the architectural design for the new high schools included alternative or auxiliary spaces of children with special needs.

Mr. Haasch noted that the numbering for the neighborhood park facilities were incorrect.

Mr. Rob Key responded to questions from the Commission relative to comparison costs for leasing equipment and vehicles; and alternative fuel.

The Commission recessed at 2:36 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 2:48 p.m.

Mr. Robinson replaced Ms. Tara McGee on the dais.

Mr. Bass stated that the Commission will vote on the Public Facilities Plan separately from the draft Comprehensive Plan.

The Commission began review of the Public Facilities Plan. A summary of the Commission's recommendations, to be voted on at a future work session, is set forth below:

Mr. Gulley questioned the structure of the following sentence and noted the sentence lumps renovation and replacement into one (1) category. "This plan recognizes that investments in existing facilities through either renovation or replacement are generally more beneficial than building new facilities".

It was the consensus of the Commission to hear comments from various departments on their views of the Public Facilities Plan.

Page 2 – General Recommendations: Add wording to read "Incorporate green building design and other energy-efficient practices in the construction and renovation of facilities **where appropriate**."

Page 3 – Add new asterisk to read "* For the purpose of this document, major arterial road recommendations for site criteria include minor arterial roadways."

Fire & Emergency Medical Services

Chief James Fitch stated Fire and Emergency Medical Service (EMS) supported the Public Facilities Plan.

In response to Mr. Gulley's comment, Chief Fitch stated in terms of co-location with other facilities, the best partner for co-location would be a use that generates little to no traffic.

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Chief Fitch stated a more direct access to the Newbys Bridge area would improve Fire and EMS response time.

Mr. John McCracken stated the Department of Transportation would provide a copy of the cost estimates for the Manchester Fire Station Analysis of Alternative Means of Fire Apparatus Access to Newbys Bridge Road.

Police Services

Ms. Deana Haggerty, Police Department representative, stated the Police Department supported the Public Facilities Plan.

In response to Mr. Waller's request, Mr. Haasch stated staff would provide a copy of the Chesterfield County Police Radio Zones.

Page 8 – Recommended Site Criteria: Add wording to read “Police facilities should be **considered for co-location** with other public facilities for maximum efficiency.”

Sheriff's Office Services

There was no representation from the Sheriff's Office; therefore, it was the consensus of the Commission to review this section at a later time.

Libraries

Mr. Mike Mabe, Library Director, supported the Public Facilities Plan; however, he did not agree with the multi-story configurations recommendation.

The Commission asked Mr. Mabe to provide a minimum buildable acres requirement for the recommended site criteria.

Page 12 – Recommended Site Criteria: Delete wording “~~Facilities should be located in CENTERS shown on the Land Use Plan Map.~~”

Page 13 – Recommended Building Design Criteria: Delete wording “~~Consideration should be given to multi-story configurations to reduce site acreage and building footprint.~~”

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Ms. Martha Reiss stated the Reams-Gordon Branch was fully funded for capital but was not fully funded for operations.

Page 13 – First Priority: Delete wording to read “Reams-Gordon Branch: 2004 Bond referendum – ~~not fully funded by bond~~, site acquired. Construct a 20,000 square foot facility. Addresses demand issues.”

Page 13 – First Priority: Delete wording to read “Western Hull Street Branch: “~~2004 Bond referendum – not fully funded by bond, site proffered.~~ Construct a 20,000 square foot facility. Addresses service gap and demand issues.”

Sheriff's Office Services

Mr. Clay Bowles, Chief of Administrative Services, stated his department supports the Public Facilities Plan.

Page 11 – Additional Recommendations: Add and delete wording to read “**The Sheriff's Department** will continue to **work with judicial system on** ~~provide~~ alternatives to incarceration.” ~~(such as work release, work weekender, and home incarceration programs) for inmates meeting certain criteria as identified by the Sheriff's Office, in order to help reduce demand for detention facilities.~~

Public Schools

Dr. Cynthia Richardson, Director of Planning, suggested the following changes to the Public Schools section:

Page 16 – System-wide Recommended Site Criteria: Add wording to read “**When possible** school facilities should be co-located with other public facilities for maximum efficiency. Flexibility to site acreage will be provided when considering co-location. Recommended co-location opportunities could include, but need not be limited to, facilities for other Schools, Parks, and Libraries.”

Page 17 – System-wide Recommended Building Design Criteria: Add wording to read “**When considered use** multi-story building configurations for new construction and additions to Middle Schools and High Schools to reduce site requirements.”

Page 17 – Recommended High School Site Criteria: Add wording to read “**When possible** new facilities should be located in CENTERS or CORRIDORS and not within residential neighborhoods.”

Page 17 – Recommended High School Site Criteria: Add wording to read “**When possible** new facilities should be located adjacent to, or near, community or regional parks.”

Mr. Gulley requested a response from the School Administration on their position for co-location; and directed Dr. Richardson to present the school section of the Public Facilities Plan to the School Board.

In response to the Commission’s comment, Mr. Robinson stated the County Attorney’s Office will revise the wording for the following bullet on page 16: System-wide Recommended Timing for New Facilities: ~~“Manage the timing of new development to coordinate with adequate school capacity. Where capacity is not available to serve students from the property seeking a change, and the developer is unable to provide adequate mitigation, the county may consider using the lack of school capacity as one of the factors for denial of petitions for rezoning.”~~ to read “**The County may consider recommended levels of service for public facilities during consideration of zoning applications, but the fact that public facilities in the area of the zoning application do not meet the recommendations of this Plan cannot, standing alone, justify denial of the rezoning application.**”

Page 17 – Recommended High School Building Design Criteria: Add wording to read “**When considered** use multi-storied designs to reduce building footprint and site acreage.”

Page 18 – Recommended Middle School Building Design Criteria: Add wording to read “**When considered** use multi-storied designs to reduce building footprint and site acreage.”

In response to Mr. Bass’ question, Dr. Richardson stated during a community meeting to discuss the maximum number of students for a proposed high school, the community expressed they did not want large mega high schools in the County.

Ms. Fassett stated the Public Facilities Plan was distributed to the Board of Supervisors, School Board and Planning Commission in January 2011.

Parks & Recreation

Mr. Stuart Connock, Chief of Parks/Design and Construction, suggested the following changes to the Parks & Recreation section:

Page 23 – System-wide Recommendations: Add wording to read “To the greatest extent practicable, parks **excluding special purpose parks** should be co-located with compatible public facilities according to park type and should be in close proximity to residential areas.”

Page 23 – System-wide Recommendations: Add wording to read “Use the provision of park **athletic** facilities at schools to supplement, or replace through co-location, the need for stand-alone parks.”

Page 23 – System-wide Level of Service Standard: Change wording to read “Provide **8.9** acres of regional, community and/or neighborhood parkland per 1,000 persons.”

Page 23 – System-wide Level of Service Standard: Change wording to read “Calculation of parkland meeting the overall Level of Service standard ~~includes~~ **excludes** Pocahontas State Park (considered a regional park) and recreational facilities located co-located at schools.”

Mr. Haasch stated excluding Pocahontas State Park would require locating a park next to a park in order to alleviate the park demand around that area. He stated changing the Level of Service in these sections requires new recommendations for new sites for this segment of the Plan; and to change the Level of Service standards from 8 to 9, the public facilities modeling would have to be recalibrated.

The Commission directed Mr. Connock to work with staff on a feasible recommendation.

Page 24 – Recommended Site Criteria: Delete wording to read “Community parks should be co-located with ~~middle and/or high~~ school facilities where possible and be open to the general public during non-school hours. Continue share-use agreements with the public schools for use of school athletic fields for public park use.”

Mr. Connock noted the naming of some of the existing parks were incorrect.

Transportation

Mr. McCracken asked for consideration to be given to locating facilities where there are adequate and safe roads.

Mr. Jim Banks recommended to following changes to: Page 3 – Delete and add wording to read “~~Include access and other transportation improvements as needed to improve safety and traffic flow when constructing new, and renovating existing, public facilities~~ Facilities should only be located where the road network is safe and adequate, or the roads are improved in conjunction with development or renovation of the facility. Other transportation improvements, such as traffic signals and turn lanes, may also be needed.”

Page 17 – Recommended High School Site Criteria: Add wording to read “Facilities should be located with **multiple** direct accesses to at least one, but preferably two, major arterial roads.”

General Services

Mr. Rob Key, Director of General Services, expressed support for the Public Facilities Plan.

Telecommunications

Mr. Haasch stated staff worked with the Zoning Team on this segment.

Mr. Haasch stated the real impact to the Public Facilities Plan would be the lost to the Countryside designation because there are specific Level of Service standards for that Countryside area. He stated if the Commission recommends removing the Countryside designation, it would necessitate a complete recalibration of all of the Level of Service and new facility recommendations to accommodate potential growth in that area.

It was the consensus of the Commission to begin reviewing the Transportation Element at their June 23, 2011 special meeting.

TENTATIVE DATES FOR JULY SPECIAL MEETINGS.

The Commission discussed tentative special meeting dates for the month of July, to be voted on at their June 21, 2011 special meeting. The dates are as follows: July 11, 2011, July 21, 2011 and July 25, 2011.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, it was on motion of Mr. Hassen, seconded by Mr. Gulley, that the meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m. to Monday, June 21, 2011, at 1:00 p.m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, Chesterfield, Virginia.

Chairman/Date

Secretary/Date